

AD-A113 790

MASSACHUSETTS INST OF TECH CAMBRIDGE DEPT OF CHEMISTRY

F/6 7/5

STERIC EFFECT OF PHOSPHORUS LIGANDS ON $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-DONOR})$ AND $\text{Ru}_3\text{---ETC(U)}$

APR 82 J L GRAFF, R D SANNER, M S WRIGHTON


N00014-75-C-0080

UNCLASSIFIED

TR-33-ONR

NL

1 of 1
AD-A113 790



AD A113790

UNCLASSIFIED

12

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ONR-TR-33	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. AD-A113790	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) "Steric Effect of Phosphorus Ligands on $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4$ - (P-Donor) and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P-Donor})_3$ Photocatalyzed 1-Pentene Isomerization"		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Interim Technical Report
7. AUTHOR(s) James L. Graff, Robert D. Sanner, and Mark S. Wrighton		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS Department of Chemistry Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) N00014-75-C-0880
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Office of Naval Research Department of the Navy Arlington, Virginia 22217		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS NR 051-579
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		12. REPORT DATE April 1982
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 36
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASSIFIED
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Distribution unlimited; approved for public release; reproduction is permitted for any purpose of the United States Government		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Distribution of this document is unlimited		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES Prepared and accepted for publication in the journal <u>Organometallics</u>		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) photochemistry, steric effects, isomerization, thermodynamics, photocatalysis		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) Photoexcitation at 355 nm of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ ($\text{L} = \text{CO}$, PPh_3 , $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$, and $\text{P}(\text{O}-o\text{-tolyl})_3$) can be used to generate catalysts for the isomerization of 1-pentene to <u>cis</u> - and <u>trans</u> -2-pentene. Each complex gives a different initial ratio of <u>trans</u> - to <u>cis</u> -2-pentene ranging from approximately 6 for the $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3)_3$ to approximately 1 for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{P}(\text{O}-o\text{-tolyl})_3$. Comparisons of the initial ratios of the isomeriz products shows that steric effects, not electronic effects, of the P-donor ligands are responsible for the variation in isomer ratio. The more sterically demanding complexes give the smallest ratio		

DD FORM 1473

1 JAN 73

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE
S/N 0102-014-66011

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

(over)

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

of trans- to cis-2-pentene. Thus, sterically crowded complexes give enrichment of the less thermodynamically stable alkene. Similarly, beginning with cis-2-pentene, $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$ gives a much smaller ratio of trans-2-pentene to 1-pentene at low conversion than does $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ under 355 nm irradiation. Initial quantum yields for isomerization generally exceed unity and the ultimate distribution of alkenes is the thermodynamic ratio, evidencing the photochemical formation of a thermally active catalyst. For $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ the only detected primary photoprocess is dissociative loss of CO with a quantum yield of ~ 0.4 , while for $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{10}\text{L}_3$ the primary photoprocess is proposed to be rupture of a metal-metal bond.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	



UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE(When Data Entered)

OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH

CONTRACT N00014-75-C-0880

Task No. NR 051-579

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 33

"STERIC EFFECT OF PHOSPHORUS LIGANDS ON $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-DONOR})$ AND
 $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P-DONOR})_3$ PHOTOCATALYZED 1-PENTENE ISOMERIZATION"

by

James L. Graff, Robert D. Sanner and Mark S. Wrighton

Department of Chemistry
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Prepared for publication in the journal Organometallics

April 1982

Reproduction in whole or in part is permitted for any
purpose of the United States Government.

This document has been approved for public release and
sale; its distribution is unlimited.

82 04 26 085

Steric Effect of Phosphorus Ligands on $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4(\text{P-donor})$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P-donor})_3$
Photocatalyzed 1-Pentene Isomerization

James L. Graff, Robert D. Sanner and Mark S. Wrighton*

Department of Chemistry
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

*Address correspondence to this author

Abstract

Photoexcitation at 355 nm of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ ($\text{L} = \text{CO}, \text{PPh}_3, \text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$, and $\text{P}(O\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3$) can be used to generate catalysts for the isomerization of 1-pentene to cis- and trans-2-pentene. Each complex gives a different initial ratio of trans- to cis-2-pentene ranging from approximately 6 for $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}$ and $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3)_3$ to approximately 1 for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{P}(O\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3$. Comparisons of the initial ratios of the isomeric products shows that steric effects, not electronic effects, of the P-donor ligands are responsible for the variation in isomer ratio. The more sterically demanding complexes give the smallest ratio of trans- to cis-2-pentene. Thus, sterically crowded complexes give enrichment of the less thermodynamically stable alkene. Similarly, beginning with cis-2-pentene, $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$ gives a much smaller ratio of trans-2-pentene to 1-pentene at low conversion than does $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ under 355 nm irradiation. Initial quantum yields for isomerization generally exceed unity and the ultimate distribution of alkenes is the thermodynamic ratio, evidencing the photochemical formation of a thermally active catalyst. For $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ the only detected primary photoprocess is dissociative loss of CO with a quantum yield of ~0.4, while for $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ the primary photoprocess is proposed to be rupture of a metal-metal bond.

Introduction

In homogeneous catalysis it is well established that the ligands in the coordination sphere of a metal-centered catalyst during the actual catalytic reaction can influence the rate and product distribution of the reaction.¹ This effect of the ligands may be divided into steric and electronic effects. One class of ligands that has been studied in this regard is the phosphorus ligands. These ligands are ideal for two reasons; (1) they are capable of stabilizing many complexes² (e.g. metal alkyls and metal hydrides) that are important in homogeneous catalytic systems, and (2) a vast number of phosphorus ligands exhibiting a wide range of steric and electronic properties are known.³ The steric and electronic properties of many phosphorus ligands have been quantified and tabulated by Tolman.^{3b} Examples of phosphorus ligands influencing the rate and/or product distribution of a reaction by primarily steric⁴ or electronic^{4b,5} effects are known, but in other cases the nature of the ligand effect is ambiguous.⁶ Perhaps the two most significant contributions of phosphorus ligand effects have been realized in the rhodium catalyzed hydroformylation of olefins^{4a,7} and in the rhodium catalyzed asymmetric synthesis of *l*-DOPA.⁸ In both cases optimal results are obtained primarily by altering the structural properties of the phosphorus ligands bonded to the metal center.

In the course of our work on the photocatalyzed 1-pentene isomerization using mono- and trinuclear iron and ruthenium complexes, we noted that the initial catalysis product ratio is dependent on the catalyst precursor used.⁹ Further investigation showed that this ratio would vary simply by varying the phosphorus ligand bonded to the catalyst precursor. This afforded us an opportunity to examine the effect of the phosphorus ligand on the course of this reaction. No such investigation into the factors affecting product

distributions has been done with any photocatalytic system. Herein, we report our results concerning the photocatalyzed isomerization of 1-pentene using the catalyst precursors, $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]$ and $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]$ ($\text{L} = \text{CO}, \text{PPh}_3, \text{P}(\text{OMe})_3, \text{P}(\text{O-}o\text{-tolyl})_3$).

Experimental

Materials. All solvents were reagent grade and distilled under Ar from CaH_2 or sodium benzophenone ketyl. The 1-pentene (99.9%) was obtained from Chemical Samples Co. and passed through Al_2O_3 prior to use. The *n*-hexane (99+%) and PPh_3 were obtained from Aldrich Chemical Co. and purified by distillation and recrystallization, respectively. The P(OMe)_3 (distilled prior to use) and P(0-o-tolyl)_3 (used as received), were obtained from Strem Chemical, Inc. The $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}]$ obtained from Strem Chemicals, Inc., was recrystallized, and the $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5]$ obtained from Pressure Chemicals was passed through Al_2O_3 prior to use. The $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]^{10}$ and $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]^{11}$ complexes ($\text{L} = \text{PPh}_3$, P(OMe)_3 , and P(0-o-tolyl)_3) were prepared according to known literature methods and characterized by standard spectroscopic techniques.

Instrumental. All vapor phase chromatography (vpc) was done with the use of Varian Series 1440 or 2440 gas chromatographs equipped with flame ionization detectors and a Varian A-25 strip chart recorder or a Hewlett Packard 3380S integrator. Separation of linear pentenes was accomplished on a 30' x 1/8" column of 20% propylene carbonate on Chromosorb P at 25°C. All infrared spectra were recorded with the use of matched pathlength (0.1 mm or 1.0 mm) NaCl solution cells and a Perkin Elmer Model 180 grating infrared spectrometer. All electronic absorption spectra were recorded with the use of a Cary 17. The irradiation source for 355 nm light (width at half-height of ~15 nm) was two 15 W General Electric blacklight bulbs ($\sim 10^{-6}$ ein/min). Light intensity was determined by ferrioxalate actinometry.¹²

Catalysis Procedure. Generally, a benzene solution 10^{-3} M in ruthenium catalyst precursor, 1.76 M in 1-pentene, and 0.1 M in *n*-hexane was prepared. One ml aliquots of this solution and 2 x 7 mm magnetic stir bars were placed into

Pyrex® test tubes (13 x 100 mm) with constrictions, degassed by five freeze-pump-thaw cycles, and hermetically sealed. The stirred samples were irradiated with the 355 nm light source. The samples were air-cooled to insure they remained at room temperature. Thermal controls (foil wrapped ampules containing the catalysis solutions) were placed next to the samples being photolyzed. Light intensities of 10^{-6} ein/min were determined by ferrioxalate actinometry,¹² and the solutions were analyzed by vpc following the reaction. The same procedure was used for neat 1-pentene solutions that were 2×10^{-3} M in iron catalyst precursor.

Photochemistry of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ ($\text{L} = \text{PPh}_3$, $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$, and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o}-\text{tolyl})_3$). A benzene solution $\sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$ M in $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]$ and 0.1 M in the appropriate phosphorus ligand, L' ($\text{L}' = \text{PPh}_3$, $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$, and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o}-\text{tolyl})_3$), was prepared. Three ml aliquots of this solution were placed into Pyrex® test tubes (13 x 100 mm) with constrictions, degassed by five freeze-pump-thaw cycles, and sealed hermetically. Near-UV, 355 nm, irradiation of the solutions yields initially $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{L})(\text{L}')]$ by IR spectral measurements.^{9,15} The appropriate thermal controls show no reaction on the same timescale as the photoreactions. The 366 nm reaction quantum yield for the reaction of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3]$ in the presence of 0.1 M PPh_3 was determined by irradiation of the ampules in a merry-go-round¹³ equipped with a 550 W Hanovia medium pressure mercury lamp filtered with Corning® filters 0-52 and 7-37 to isolate the 366 nm emission. The light intensity ($\sim 10^{-7}$ ein/min) was determined by ferrioxalate actinometry.¹²

Photochemistry of $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]$ ($\text{L} = \text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ or $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o}-\text{tolyl})_3$). A benzene solution $\sim 5 \times 10^{-3}$ M in $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]$ and 0.1 M in L was prepared. Three ml aliquots of this solution were placed into Pyrex® test tubes (13 x 100 mm)


with constrictions, degassed by five freeze-pump-thaw cycles, and sealed hermetically. Near-UV, 355 nm, irradiation of the solutions yielded $[\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}_2]$ by IR spectral measurements.⁹

Results and Discussion

Previous studies of photocatalyzed reactions using iron and ruthenium carbonyl catalyst precursors show that the ratio of catalysis products depends on the catalyst precursor used and can give information concerning the actual catalytically active species.^{9,14} In particular, the initial ratio of trans- to cis-2-pentene obtained in the photocatalyzed 1-pentene isomerization was about 60% lower when using the $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3]$ precursor as opposed to $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5]$.^{9b} Similar results were observed with $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}]$ and $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_3)_3]$. A key question is whether the effect of the phosphorus ligand is due to the electronic or steric properties of the ligand. A comparison of the photocatalytic activity of $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]$ and $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]$ ($\text{L} = \text{CO}$, PPh_3 , $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$, and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$) can answer this. The $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ ligands are fairly similar electronically, both less basic than PPh_3 , whereas the PPh_3 and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ ligands are sterically similar, both having larger cone angles than $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$.^{3b} This choice of complexes should enable us to differentiate between the steric and electronic effects of the phosphorus ligands on the product distribution of the photocatalyzed 1-pentene isomerization. The electronic and steric parameters of the phosphorus ligands are shown in Table I. Unfortunately, the electronic properties of $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ and $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ are not identical. However, we note that it is the sterically larger that is the best π -acceptor and hence electronically would be more like CO, the least sterically demanding ligand. In the complexes studied the CO stretching absorptions are invariably slightly higher in energy for the $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ than for the analogous $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ complexes, cf. Table II, establishing the $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ to be more CO-like than $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ with respect to electronic factors. It is clear that $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ is significantly more

structurally demanding than $P(OMe)_3$ or CO. Before discussing the catalysis results, the photochemistry of the iron and ruthenium systems should be delineated.


Photochemistry of $Fe(CO)_4L$. Near-UV, 355 nm, irradiation of $[Fe(CO)_4PPh_3]$ in the presence of 0.1 M PPh_3 yields $[Fe(CO)_3(PPh_3)_2]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 1885\text{ cm}^{-1}$).⁹ Infrared band positions for all relevant complexes are given in Table II. Photolysis of $[Fe(CO)_4PPh_3]$ in the presence of 0.1 M $P(OMe)_3$ produces $[Fe(CO)_3(PPh_3)(P(OMe)_3)]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 1898\text{ cm}^{-1}$) and not $[Fe(CO)_4P(OMe)_3]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 2063, 1992, 1963, \text{ and } 1951\text{ cm}^{-1}$) or $[Fe(CO)_3(P(OMe)_3)_2]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 1920 \text{ and } 1912\text{ cm}^{-1}$).¹⁵ Thus, the primary photoreaction for $[Fe(CO)_4PPh_3]$ is loss of CO with a 366 nm quantum yield of 0.4 ± 0.04 , equation (1). This parallels the



photochemistry observed for the $[Ru(CO)_4PPh_3]$ complex.^{9a} Photolysis of $[Fe(CO)_4P(OMe)_3]$ in the presence of 0.1 M PPh_3 yields $[Fe(CO)_3(PPh_3)(P(OMe)_3)]$, and near UV, 355 nm, irradiation of $[Fe(CO)_4P(O\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 2065, 1995, 1965 \text{ and } 1959\text{ cm}^{-1}$) in the presence of 0.1 M PPh_3 yields apparently $[Fe(CO)_3(PPh_3)P(O\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3]$ ($\nu_{CO} = 1905\text{ cm}^{-1}$). No $[Fe(CO)_4PPh_3]$ was detected in either reaction. The quantum yields for CO dissociation from $[Fe(CO)_4P(OMe)_3]$ and $[Fe(CO)_4P(O\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3]$ have not been determined quantitatively but are similar to that found for $[Fe(CO)_4PPh_3]$. The products trans- $Fe(CO)_3LL'$ formed from irradiation of $Fe(CO)_4L$ in the presence of L' appear to be initially formed quantitatively, based on disappearance of starting material. The broad prominent infrared absorption in the CO stretching region is consistent with the trans arrangement of L and L' .^{9,15} No other metal-containing products are detectable by infrared and, in particular,

we note that there is no loss of L from $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ to form $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}'$ in the presence of L' for the systems studied. All data are for conversion of <20%.

The observed photochemistry of the $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]$ complexes logically results from ligand field excited states involving the population of the σ -antibonding d_z^2 orbital,¹⁶ since the $\text{Fe}(\text{O})$ complexes have the d-orbital diagram represented by Scheme I. All of the $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ complexes have the same geometrical structure




Scheme I. d-Orbital Diagram for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ Complexes.

and belong to the C_{3v} point group and the donor atoms are all the same. The $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ complexes only show tail absorption in the near-uv and no well-defined band can therefore be attributed to the $e \rightarrow a_1$ transitions. However, the dissociative loss of CO is an unambiguous result empirically, and an expected finding. The surprising finding perhaps is that the quantum yield for loss of L, particularly L = phosphite, is insignificant. Since the phosphite ligands are on the z-axis and have CO-like properties and the d_z^2 orbital is principally σ -antibonding along the z-axis, the lack of P-donor loss is surprising. However, the photoinert Fe-P bond is what allows an investigation of the P-donor structural effects, since the P-donor must, presumably, remain in the coordination sphere to exert effects on the distribution of catalytic products. Note that the photochemistry only establishes that the excited state does not detectably lose the P-donor ligand. That the P-donor remains bound during the (thermal) catalytic chemistry that


occurs after CO loss is demonstrated by the different ratio of initial catalytic products as L is varied, vide infra.

Finally, concerning the photochemistry of $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ it is noteworthy that 355 nm irradiation in the presence of 1-pentene yields infrared detectable, but very thermally (25°C) substitution labile, 1-pentene complexes, equation (2).



Infrared data in the CO stretching region are included in Table II. The noteworthy finding is that for $\text{L} = \text{PPh}_3$ and $\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ there are three infrared bands consistent with a cis disposition of the alkene and the P-donor. However, for $\text{L} = \text{P}(\text{O-o-tolyl})_3$ there is only one band, consistent with a trans arrangement of the P-donor and the alkene. This result alone clearly establishes a basis for the assertion that the nature of the P-donor can significantly alter the catalytic chemistry in these photochemical systems. But notice here that PPh_3 , having a slightly larger core angle than the $\text{P}(\text{O-o-tolyl})_3$, gives a cis complex whereas the $\text{P}(\text{O-o-tolyl})_3$ gives trans. There is clearly a role for both electronic and geometric structure effects from L on the nature of the alkene complexes, as is almost always the case in attempts to separate electronic and steric effects on chemical reactivity.

Photochemistry of $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$. Photolysis of $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_{12}]$ in the presence of CO or 1-pentene results in fragmentation of the cluster with a quantum yield of $\sim 10^{-2}$, as shown in equation (3).^{14,17} The irradiation of $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{PPh}_3]$ in the



presence of CO or PPh₃ yields [Ru(CO)₄PPh₃] or [Ru(CO)₃(PPh₃)₂], respectively, also with low quantum efficiency.^{9a} In both cases optical excitation results in the population of an orbital which is strongly σ-antibonding with respect to the Ru-Ru bonds.¹⁸ The reactions are thought to proceed via photoinduced metal-metal bond homolysis, generating a tethered diradical species which subsequently thermally fragments into mononuclear species.^{9a,14,17c} Consistently, optical excitation of [Ru₃(CO)₉(P(OMe)₃)₃] in the presence of 0.1 M P(OMe)₃ yields [Ru(CO)₃(P(OMe)₃)₂] (ν_{CO} = 1924 and 1915 cm⁻¹), and irradiation of [Ru₃(CO)₉(P(O-o-tolyl)₃)₃] in the presence of 0.1 M P(O-o-tolyl)₃ yields [Ru(CO)₃(P(O-o-tolyl)₃)₂] (ν_{CO} = 1926 and 1917 cm⁻¹). The Ru(CO)₃L₂ products have infrared spectra consistent with a trans arrangement of the two L's and are clearly derivatives of the known PPh₃ species.^{9a} The yield of Ru(CO)₃L₂ from irradiation of Ru₃(CO)₉L₃ in the presence of L is initially quantitative based on infrared spectral measurements. Although the quantum yields of these latter two reactions have not been determined, both reactions are qualitatively quantum inefficient. The photofragmentation of these clusters is expected to occur by the same mechanism proposed for [Ru₃(CO)₁₂] and [Ru₃(CO)₉(PPh₃)₃].

The irradiation of the Ru₃(CO)₉L₃ complexes can be carried out using visible light, since these complexes have an intense (ε ~ 10,000 M⁻¹cm⁻¹) absorption band at about 500 nm. The first band position varies with L in the following manner: L = CO λ_{max} = 396 nm; L = P(OMe)₃ λ_{max} = 431 nm; L =

$P(0\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3$ $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 444$ nm; and $L = PPh_3$ $\lambda_{\text{max}} = 506$ nm. Near-uv and visible excitation give the same quantum yields. Interestingly, visible light (514.5 nm from an Ar-ion laser) photoexcitation of the $Ru_3(CO)_9L_3$ complexes in the presence of 1.76 M 1-pentene does not lead to rapid loss of the Ru complexes except for $L = CO$. The quantum yield for disappearance of $Ru_3(CO)_9L_3$ where $L = PPh_3$ is $<10^{-4}$ and there are no alkene products detected by infrared. It appears that mononuclear $Ru(CO)_4PPh_3$ and $Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)_2$ are formed slowly. Similarly, irradiation of $Ru(CO)_4PPh_3$ that is known to yield dissociative loss of CO⁹ does not lead to the build-up of the expected $Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)(1\text{-pentene})$ when the irradiation is carried out in the presence of high concentrations of 1-pentene in sealed reaction vessels. Under the same conditions $Fe(CO)_3(PPh_3)(1\text{-pentene})$ can be formed, vide supra, from irradiation of $Fe(CO)_4PPh_3$. These data, taken together, imply that the alkene complexes of Ru are much more labile than the analogous complexes for Fe which themselves are thermally labile at 25°C. Consistent with this conclusion, irradiation of $Ru(CO)_4PPh_3$ in 7.8 M 1-pentene in benzene while purging with N_2 to remove photoejected CO yields infrared spectral changes consistent with formation of $Ru(CO)_3(PPh_3)(\text{alkene})$; two new bands in the CO stretching region were observed at 2033 and 1976 cm^{-1} . These two bands disappear rapidly upon exposing the solution to CO and starting material is regenerated.

Effect of Variation in L on Photocatalyzed Isomerization of 1-Pentene. All the $[Fe(CO)_4L]$ and $[Ru_3(CO)_9L_3]$ ($L = CO, PPh_3, P(OMe)_3$, and $P(0\text{-}o\text{-tolyl})_3$) catalyst precursors effectively catalyze the isomerization of 1-pentene to trans- and cis-2-pentene upon near-UV, 355 nm, irradiation at 25°C. The particulars of the 1-pentene isomerization are given in Table III. No isomerization occurs thermally at 25°C on the same timescale as the photo-reactions. All the


catalyst precursors are capable of moving high concentrations of 1-pentene toward the thermodynamic ratio of linear pentenes,¹⁹ demonstrating large turnover numbers (number of 1-pentene molecules consumed per metal atom initially present) which are at least 10^3 . Further, observed initial quantum yields, Φ , (number of 1-pentene molecules isomerized per incident photon) are high and often exceed unity, evidencing the photo-generation of a very active catalyst at room temperature.

The most important result is that the initial ratio of trans- to cis-2-pentene depends on the catalyst precursor used. There is a significant variation as the phosphorus ligand bonded to the iron carbonyl catalyst precursor is varied. The $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}]$ catalyst precursors bearing sterically similar phosphorus ligands (PPh_3 and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$) give similar initial ratios of trans- to cis-2-pentene, whereas those bearing electronically similar phosphorus ligands ($\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3$ and $\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$) do not yield similar ratios of 2-pentenes. The steric bulk of the phosphorus ligand affects the distribution of catalysis products; the bulkier the ligand the more cis-2-pentene formed relative to trans-2-pentene. Note that the ratio of trans- to cis-2-pentene obtained with $[\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5]$ is greater than those obtained with the phosphorus ligand substituted iron catalyst precursors. This is consistent with the steric bulk of the ligands affecting the catalysis product distributions, since CO, having an estimated cone angle of 95° ,^{3b} is less bulky than the phosphorus ligands studied here. Similar results are observed with the $[\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3]$ catalyst precursors. Product distributions in thermal olefin isomerization reactions are sensitive to the steric interactions of the coordinated organic ligand with the other ligands present in the coordination sphere.^{1b,4i,j} Bulky ligands favor the formation of the cis-olefin over the trans-olefin. Likewise, in these photocatalyzed 1-pentene isomerizations the bulky ligands favor the

formation of cis-2-pentene relative to trans-2-pentene. This is reasonable since a cis-2-pentene ligand would be less sterically demanding than a trans-2-pentene ligand bonded to a metal, complexes (A) and (B). Increasing




(A)




(B)

the bulk of the other ligands in the coordination sphere could change the relative stability of A and B leading to thermodynamic effects that could result in a kinetic preference for formation of cis-alkenes. We conclude that the effect of the phosphorus ligand on the initial product distribution in these photocatalyzed reactions is primarily steric. The electronic properties may also be contributory, but the data suggests that electronic effects on the initial ratio of 2-pentenes are minor compared to the steric effects of the phosphorus ligands.

The consequences from electronic structure on geometrical structure is evident from the infrared spectra of the $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}(1\text{-pentene})$ complexes, vide supra and Table II. It is apparent from the data in Table III that $\text{L} = \text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3$ or PPh_3 do not give very different initial product ratios, despite the different structure for the 1-pentene complexes $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}(1\text{-pentene})$. However, it must be realized that $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3\text{L}(1\text{-pentene})$ itself must be at least one step away from the active alkene isomerization catalyst. We believe that loss of a second CO, equation (4), must occur in



order to actually effect catalysis. The resulting 16-valence electron species can reversibly form either a syn- or anti- π -allyl-hydride as a precursor to the cis- and trans-2-pentene complexes, respectively, equation (5). The point is



that some species beyond the 18-valence electron $\text{Fe(CO)}_3\text{L(1-pentene)}$ is where the ratio of initial products is determined. Thus, the different structures of $\text{Fe(CO)}_3\text{L(1-pentene)}$ establish that the different P-donors can give different geometries for the products, but the structure of these do not reveal the structure of the actual species that controls the initial distribution of olefin products.

In the catalysis experiments described so far, we began with 1-pentene and formed trans- and cis-2-pentene in a fashion such that the initial distribution of the two isomers was enriched in the thermodynamically less stable isomer, cis-2-pentene, compared to what the ratio would be at thermodynamic equilibrium. Ultimately, for all of the catalyst precursors the distribution of 1-pentene, trans-, and cis-2-pentene does come to the thermodynamic equilibrium. But the kinetically controlled initial distribution of products can differ considerably from that at thermodynamic equilibrium. Indeed, irradiation of the complex $\text{Fe(CO)}_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$ yields photocatalyzed 1-pentene

isomerization giving an initial trans- to cis-2-pentene ratio of about 0.6, even lower than for $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3$. Thus, the greater steric bulk of the two PPh_3 ligands, compared to the single PPh_3 , gives a larger kinetic preference for the less thermodynamically stable 2-pentene isomer. As illustrated by the data in Table IV, photocatalyzed isomerization of 1-pentene yields significant enrichment in the cis-2-pentene isomer, and quite interestingly the data show that in absolute terms at the greatest extent conversion there is more cis-2-pentene than would be present at the thermodynamic equilibrium of the linear pentenes which is ~3% 1-pentene, ~76% trans-2-pentene. Starting with pure cis-2-pentene further illustrates that the sterically demanding system, $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_n(\text{PPh}_3)_2$, yields the greater enrichment of the thermodynamically least stable product, Table IV. In fact, at 38.4% conversion the amount of 1-pentene present is 5.7% of all the linear pentene in the solution, or roughly twice the amount present at the thermodynamic equilibrium. This clearly illustrates that the kinetically controlled product distribution from the photogenerated catalyst is enriched in the least stable isomer, but as indicated above, the linear pentenes are ultimately equilibrated to the ratio that would be obtained from any other catalyst.

Quantum yields for isomerization generally exceed unity, indicating that a thermal catalyst is in fact generated. Moreover, the turnover rate of the catalyst must exceed the photoexcitation rate, $\sim 1.6 \times 10^{-6}$ ein/min, otherwise the initial quantum yields would be less than one. But generally, we have used continuous irradiation to effect photocatalysis, since back reaction of coordinatively unsaturated species with photoejected CO precludes sustained catalysis at 25°C after irradiation is terminated. The use of continuous irradiation raises the possibility that one could, in fact, drive the linear

pentenes to a photostationary state that is enriched in 1-pentene, the least thermodynamically stable isomer. Empirically, this is not found; the ultimate distribution of the linear pentenes is just that found from conventional thermal catalysis.

To summarize our main finding then, we conclude that steric effects of ligands L in $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_4\text{L}$ or $\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9\text{L}_3$ promote the formation of the least thermodynamically stable pentene at initial stages of the photocatalyzed isomerization of pentene. Examples of other catalytic reactions in which the steric bulk of the phosphorus ligands affects the product distribution are the rhodium catalyzed hydroformylation reactions^{4a,d,g,7} and some nickel catalyzed olefin reactions.^{4b,c} In the former system, Pruett and Smith^{4a} showed that both the steric and electronic effects are important since increased electron donation from the ligand decreases the percentage of the normal isomer obtained but increased ligand bulk decreases the percentage of the normal isomer even more. In the nickel catalyzed reaction of butadiene with morpholine Baker and co-workers^{4b} showed that the percentage of products resulting from butadiene dimerization could be greatly enhanced by using bulky phosphorus ligands. The electronic effects of the phosphorus ligands on the product distribution were believed to be negligible in comparison. In both of these systems by knowing the nature of the effect of the phosphorus ligands on the product distribution, the reactions can be "tuned" to give the desired results simply by changing the phosphorus ligand. The results of our photocatalyzed 1-pentene isomerization reactions clearly demonstrate that the product distribution of photocatalyzed reactions can also be "tuned" in a similar manner, in this case by changing the steric bulk of the bonded phosphorus ligand. Inasmuch as the alkene isomerization that we have studied depends on the excitation rate (light intensity) it is clear that the activation energy for the catalysis is low.

Future studies in this laboratory will include the use of photoexcitation to promote reaction where the temperature is sufficiently low to attempt to reach a situation where some step in the actual catalytic reaction is rate limiting.

Acknowledgement. We thank the National Science Foundation and the Office of Naval Research for partial support of this research.

REFERENCES

1. For general references, see: (a) Cotton, F.A.; Wilkinson, G. "Advanced Inorganic Chemistry", 4th ed., Wiley-Interscience: New York, 1980, pp. 1265-1309; (b) Parshall, G.W. "Homogeneous Catalysis", Wiley-Interscience: New York, 1980; (c) Stone, F.G.A.; West, R., eds., "Advances in Organometallic Chemistry", Vol. 17, "Catalysis and Organic Synthesis", Academic Press: New York, 1979; (d) Kochi, J.K. "Organometallic Mechanisms and Catalysis", Academic Press: New York, 1978; (e) Forster, D.; Roth, J.F., eds., "Homogeneous Catalysis, Advances in Chemistry Series", Vol. 132, American Chemical Society: Washington, 1974.
2. (a) Muetterties, E.L., ed., "Transition Metal Hydrides", Marcel Dekker, Inc.: New York, 1971; (b) Chatt, J. Adv. Organomet. Chem., 1974, 12, 1; (c) Booth, C. Adv. Inorg. and Radiochem., 1964, 6, 1; (d) Klein, H.-F. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1980, 19, 362; (e) Kaesz, H.D.; Sallant, R.B. Chem. Rev., 1972, 72, 231.
3. (a) Mason, R.; Meek, D.W. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1978, 17, 183; (b) Tolman, C.A. Chem. Rev., 1977, 77, 313, and references therein.
4. (a) Pruett, R.L.; Smith, J.A. J. Org. Chem., 1969, 34, 327; (b) Baker, R.; Onions, A.; Popplestone, R.J.; Smith, T.N. J. Chem. Soc., Perkin Trans., 2, 1975, 1133; (c) Binger, P.; McMeeking, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1973, 12, 995; (d) Tanaka, M.; Hayashi, T.; Ogata, I. B. Chem. Soc. Jpn., 1977, 50, 2351; (e) Trost, B.M.; Strege, P.E. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1975, 97, 2534; (f) Musco, A.; Perego, C.; Tartari, V. Inorg. Chim. Acta, 1978, 28, L147; (g) Pittman, C.U.; Hirao, A. J. Org. Chem., 1978, 43, 640; (h) Vastag, S.; Heil, B.; Marko, L. J. Mol. Catal., 1979, 5, 189; (i) Bingham, D.; Webster, D.E.; Wells, P.B. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1974, 1514, 1519; (j) Bingham, D.; Hudson, B.; Webster, D.E.; Wells, P.B. ibid., 1974, 1521.
5. (a) Schrock, R.R.; Osborn, J.A. J. Chem. Soc., Chem. Commun., 1970, 567; (b) Schrock, R.R.; Osborn, J.A. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1976, 98, 2134 and 2143.
6. (a) Strohmeier, W.; Weigelt, L. J. Organomet. Chem., 1977, 125, C40; (b) Strohmeier, W.; Weigelt, L. ibid., 1977, 133, C43; (c) Lieto, J.; Rafalko, J.J.; Gates, B.C. J. Catal., 1980, 62, 149; (d) Baker, R.; Crimmin, M.J. J. Chem. Soc., Perkins Trans., 1, 1979, 1264; (e) Vaglio, G.A.; Valle, M. Inorg. Chim. Acta, 1978, 30, 161.
7. Pruett, R.L. Adv. Organomet. Chem., 1979, 17, 1, and references therein.
8. (a) Knowles, W.S.; Sabacky, M.J.; Vineyard, B.D.; Weinkauff, D.J. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1975, 97, 2567, and references therein; (b) Koenig, K.E.; Sabacky, M.J.; Bachman, G.L.; Christopf, W.C.; Barnstorff, H.D.; Friedman, R.B.; Knowles, W.S.; Stults, B.R.; Vineyard, B.D.; Weinkauff, D.J. Ann. N.Y. Acad. Sci., 1980, 333, 16, and references therein.

- 2
9. (a) Graff, J.L.; Sanner, R.D.; Wrighton, M.S. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1979, 101, 273; (b) Sanner, R.D.; Austin, R.G.; Wrighton, M.S.; Honnick, W.D.; Pittman, C.U. Inorg. Chem., 1979, 18, 928.
 10. (a) Bruce, M.I.; Shaw, G.; Stone, F.G.A. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1972, 2094; (b) Bruce, M.I.; Shaw, G.; Stone, F.G.A. ibid., 1973, 1667.
 11. Condor, H.L.; Darensbourg, M.Y. J. Organometal. Chem., 1974, 63, 93, and references therein.
 12. Hatchard, C.G.; Parker, C.A. Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A, 1956, 235, 518.
 13. Moses, F.G.; Liu, R.S.H.; Monroe, B.M. Mol. Photochem., 1969, 1, 245.
 14. Austin, R.G.; Paonessa, R.S.; Giordano, P.J.; Wrighton, M.S. Adv. Chem. Ser., 1978, 168, 189.
 15. Crichton, A.; Rest, A.J. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1977, 536 and 656.
 16. Dartiguenave, M.; Dartiguenave, Y.; Gray, H.B. Bull. Chim. Soc. Fr., 1969, 12, 4223.
 17. (a) Johnson, B.F.G.; Lewis, J.; Twigg, M.V. J. Organomet. Chem., 1974, 67, C70; (b) Johnson, B.F.G.; Lewis, J.; Twigg, M.V. J. Chem. Soc., Dalton Trans., 1976, 1876; (c) Grevels, F.-W.; Reuvers, J.G.A.; Takats, J. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1981, 103, 4069.
 18. (a) Tyler, D.R.; Levenson, R.A.; Gray, H.B. J. Am. Chem. Soc., 1978, 100, 7888; (b) Delley, B.; Manning, M.C.; Ellis, D.E.; Berkowitz, J.; Trogler, W.C., private communication.
 19. Bond, G.C.; Hellier, M. J. Catal., 1965, 4, 1.

Table I. Steric and Electronic Parameters of Phosphorus Ligands.^a

L, Phosphorus Ligand	Cone Angle (θ), deg ^b	Electronic Parameter (ν), cm ^{-1c}
P(OMe) ₃	107	2079.5
P(O- <u>o</u> -tol) ₃	141	2084.1
PPh ₃	145	2068.9

^aValues obtained from ref. 3b.

^bThe steric parameter (cone angle), as determined by Tolman,^{3b} is the apex angle of a cylindrical cone, centered 2.28 Å from the center of the P atom, which just touches the van der Waals radii of the outermost atoms of the CPK molecular model of the ligand.

^cThe electronic parameter, as determined by Tolman,^{3b} is the frequency of the A₁ carbonyl mode of Ni(CO)₃L (L = phosphorus ligand) in CH₂Cl₂. This band is measured with an accuracy of ± 0.3 cm⁻¹.

Table II. Infrared Band Positions in CO Stretching Region for Relevant Complexes at 25°C.

Complex	Solvent	Band Positions, cm ⁻¹
Fe(CO) ₅	isooctane 1-pentene	2022;2000 2023;2000
Fe(CO) ₄ (PPh ₃)	benzene isooctane	2049;1973;1939 2054;1978;1942
Fe(CO) ₄ (P(OMe) ₃)	benzene isooctane	2060;1986;(1951,1944) ^a 2060;1992;(1962,1950) ^a
Fe(CO) ₄ (P(O- <u>o</u> -tolyl) ₃)	benzene isooctane	2064;1992;(1960,1955) ^a 2065;1995;(1965,1959) ^a
Fe(CO) ₄ (1-pentene)	isooctane 1-pentene	2081;1978 (other bands obscured by Fe(CO) ₅) 2082;1978 (other bands obscured by Fe(CO) ₅)
Fe(CO) ₄ (<u>cis</u> -2-pentene)	isooctane	2077;1995;1973
Fe(CO) ₄ (<u>trans</u> -2-pentene)	isooctane	2079;1997;1975
Fe(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃) ₂	benzene isooctane	1885 1893
Fe(CO) ₃ (P(OMe) ₃) ₂	benzene	(1920,1912) ^a
Fe(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃)(P(OMe) ₃)	benzene	(1899,1892) ^a
Fe(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃)(P(O- <u>o</u> -tolyl) ₃)	benzene	(1907,1903) ^a
Fe(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃)(1-pentene)	benzene	2011;1944;1916
Fe(CO) ₃ (P(OMe) ₃)(1-pentene)	isooctane	2025;~1961;1930
Fe(CO) ₃ (P(O- <u>o</u> -tolyl) ₃)(1-pentene)	isooctane	~1968
Ru(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃)(1-pentene) ^b	1-pentene/ benzene	2033;1976;~1950 ^b
Ru(CO) ₃ (P(OMe) ₃) ₂	benzene	(1924,1915) ^a
Ru(CO) ₃ (P(O- <u>o</u> -tolyl) ₃) ₂	benzene	(1926,1917) ^a
Ru(CO) ₃ (PPh ₃) ₂	benzene	1895
Ru ₃ (CO) ₁₂	isooctane	2061;2031;2012

Table II. (continued)

Complex	Solvent	Band Positions, cm^{-1}
$\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{PPh}_3)_3$	CH_2Cl_2	2046;2022;1982;1975;1950sh
$\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P}(\text{OMe})_3)_3$	CH_2Cl_2	2057;1992;1982;1958
$\text{Ru}_3(\text{CO})_9(\text{P}(\text{O}-\text{o-tolyl})_3)_3$	CH_2Cl_2	2060;2006;1992;1975

^aBroad feature, slightly split with approximate maxima given.

^bGenerated by purging out CO with N_2 while irradiating $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3$ in 7.8 M 1-pentene in benzene. The lowest absorptions are obscured by the absorption of $\text{Ru}(\text{CO})_4\text{PPh}_3$ at 1952 cm^{-1} .

Table III. Comparison of Photocatalyzed 1-Pentene Isomerization Using Various Iron and Ruthenium Catalyst Precursors

A. Mononuclear Iron Species.^a

Catalyst Precursor	% Conversion ^b	ϕ^c	t/c ^d
Fe(CO) ₅	6.2	117	2.92
	11.9	112	2.93
Fe(CO) ₄ P(OMe) ₃	3.6	79	1.46
	9.8	107	1.44
Fe(CO) ₄ P(O-o-tolyl) ₃	4.4	73	1.00
	11.6	76	1.15
Fe(CO) ₄ PPh ₃	7.8	71	1.11
	12.7	58	1.20

B. Trinuclear Ruthenium Species.^e

Catalyst Precursor	% Conversion ^b	ϕ^c	t/c ^d
Ru ₃ (CO) ₁₂	7.7	5.5	5.7
	13.8	5.0	6.2
Ru ₃ (CO) ₉ (P(OMe) ₃) ₃	6.5	1.6	5.7
	18.9	3.2	6.1
Ru ₃ (CO) ₉ (P(O-o-tolyl) ₃) ₃	8.3	0.4	3.3
	16.7	0.6	3.4
Ru ₃ (CO) ₉ (PPh ₃) ₃	5.3	0.6	4.3
	10.0	0.9	3.4

^aThe catalysis solutions are neat 1-pentene containing 2×10^{-3} M iron carbonyl catalyst precursor.

^b% of 1-pentene isomerized to trans- and cis-2-pentenenes.

^c ϕ is the number of 1-pentene molecules isomerized per photon incident on the sample. Values are $\pm 20\%$.

^dRatio of trans-2-pentene to cis-2-pentene products. Values are $\pm 5\%$.

^eThe catalysis solutions are benzene solutions 1.76 M in 1-pentene and 10^{-3} M in ruthenium carbonyl catalyst precursor.

Table IV. Comparison of Photocatalyzed 1-Pentene and cis-2-Pentene
Isomerization Using $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$ and $\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$.^a

Starting Isomer	Photocatalyst	Extent Conversion, %	Φ	(t/c) ^b or (t/1-pent) ^c
1-pentene, neat	$\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$	6.2	117	2.92
		11.9	112	2.92
1-pentene, 5.0 M	$\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$	8.6	11.8	0.56
		11.2	7.7	0.57
		18.4	7.7	0.58
		43.2	2.7	0.65
<u>cis</u> -2-pentene, 2.8 M	$\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_5$	4.9	71	13
		15.3	110	13
		25.9	75	14
		51.9	25	18
<u>cis</u> -2-pentene, 2.8 M	$\text{Fe}(\text{CO})_3(\text{PPh}_3)_2$	2.8	1.3	3.7
		5.1	1.2	3.5
		10.5	1.2	3.2
		27.3	0.8	4.1
		38.4	0.6	5.9
		46.7	0.3	8.4

^aAll data from 2×10^{-3} M photocatalyst in hermetically sealed, degassed ampules. Irradiation source is 355 nm, $\sim 2 \times 10^{-6}$ ein/min.

^bRatio of trans- to cis-2-pentene starting with 1-pentene.

^cRatio of trans- to 1-pentene starting with cis-2-pentene.

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GEN

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Office of Naval Research Attn: Code 472 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	2	U.S. Army Research Office Attn: CRD-AA-IP P.O. Box 1211 Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709	1
ONR Branch Office Attn: Dr. George Sandoz 536 S. Clark Street Chicago, Illinois 60605	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Mr. Joe McCartney San Diego, California 92152	1
ONR Area Office Attn: Dr. [Signature] 715 Broadway New York, New York 10005	1	Naval Weapons Center Attn: Dr. A. B. Amster, Chemistry Division China Lake, California 93555	1
ONR Western Regional Office 1030 East Green Street Pasadena, California 91106	1	Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory Attn: Dr. R. W. Drisko Port Hueneme, California 93401	1
ONR Eastern/Central Regional Office Attn: Dr. L. H. Peebles Building 114, Section D 666 Summer Street Boston, Massachusetts 02210	1	Department of Physics & Chemistry Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, California 93940	1
Director, Naval Research Laboratory Attn: Code 6100 Washington, D.C. 20390	1	Dr. A. L. Slafkosky Scientific Advisor Commandant of the Marine Corps (Code RD-1) Washington, D.C. 20380	1
The Assistant Secretary of the Navy (RE&S) Department of the Navy Room 4E736, Pentagon Washington, D.C. 20350	1	Office of Naval Research Attn: Dr. Richard S. Miller 800 N. Quincy Street Arlington, Virginia 22217	1
Commander, Naval Air Systems Command Attn: Code 310C (H. Rosenwasser) Department of the Navy Washington, D.C. 20360	1	Naval Ship Research and Development Center Attn: Dr. G. Bosmajian, Applied Chemistry Division Annapolis, Maryland 21401	1
Defense Technical Information Center Building 5, Cameron Station Alexandria, Virginia 22314	12	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Dr. S. Yamamoto, Marine Sciences Division San Diego, California 91232	1
Dr. Fred Saalfeld Chemistry Division, Code 6100 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Mr. John Boyle Materials Branch Naval Ship Engineering Center Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, GENNo.
Copies

Dr. Rudolph J. Marcus
Office of Naval Research
Scientific Liaison Group
American Embassy
APO San Francisco 96503

1

Mr. James Kelley
DTNSRDC Code 2803
Annapolis, Maryland 21402

1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. Paul Delahay Department of Chemistry New York University New York, New York 10003	1	Dr. P. J. Hendra Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton SO9 5NH United Kingdom	1
Dr. E. Yeager Department of Chemistry Case Western Reserve University Cleveland, Ohio 44106	1	Dr. Sam Perone Department of Chemistry Purdue University West Lafayette, Indiana 47907	1
Dr. D. M. Bennion Department of Chemical Engineering Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602	1	Dr. Royce W. Murray Department of Chemistry University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514	1
Dr. R. A. Marcus Department of Chemistry California Institute of Technology Pasadena, California 91125	1	Naval Ocean Systems Center Attn: Technical Library San Diego, California 92152	1
Dr. J. J. Auborn Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. C. E. Mueller The Electrochemistry Branch Materials Division, Research & Technology Department Naval Surface Weapons Center White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1
Dr. Adam Heller Bell Laboratories Murray Hill, New Jersey 07974	1	Dr. G. Goodman Globe-Union Incorporated 5757 North Green Bay Avenue Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201	1
Dr. T. Katan Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., Inc. P.O. Box 504 Sunnyvale, California 94088	1	Dr. J. Boechler Electrochimica Corporation Attention: Technical Library 2485 Charleston Road Mountain View, California 94040	1
Dr. Joseph Singer, Code 302-1 NASA-Lewis 21000 Brookpark Road Cleveland, Ohio 44135	1	Dr. P. P. Schmidt Department of Chemistry Oakland University Rochester, Michigan 48063	1
Dr. D. Brummer FIC Incorporated 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1	Dr. H. Richtol Chemistry Department Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Troy, New York 12181	1
Library P. R. Mallory and Company, Inc. Northwest Industrial Park Burlington, Massachusetts 01803	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. A. B. Ellis Chemistry Department University of Wisconsin Madison, Wisconsin 53706	1	Dr. R. P. Van Duyne Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1
Dr. M. Wrighton Chemistry Department Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1	Dr. B. Stanley Pons Department of Chemistry University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta CANADA T6C 2G2	1
Larry F. Plew Naval Weapons Support Center Code 30736, Building 2906 Crane, Indiana 47522	1	Dr. Michael J. Weaver Department of Chemistry Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan 48824	1
S. Rohv DOF (STOR) 600 F Street Washington, D.C. 20545	1	Dr. R. David Rauh EIC Corporation 55 Chapel Street Newton, Massachusetts 02158	1
Dr. Aaron Mold Brown University Department of Chemistry Providence, Rhode Island 02192	1	Dr. J. David Margerum Research Laboratories Division Hughes Aircraft Company 3011 Malibu Canyon Road Malibu, California 90265	1
Dr. R. C. Chudacek McGraw-Edison Company Edison Battery Division Post Office Box 28 Bloomfield, New Jersey 07003	1	Dr. Martin Fleischmann Department of Chemistry University of Southampton Southampton SO9 5NH England	1
Dr. A. J. Bard University of Texas Department of Chemistry Austin, Texas 78712	1	Dr. Janet Ostervoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. M. M. Nicholson Electronics Research Center Rockwell International 3370 Miraloma Avenue Anaheim, California	1	Dr. R. A. Osteryoung Department of Chemistry State University of New York at Buffalo Buffalo, New York 14214	1
Dr. Donald W. Ernst Naval Surface Weapons Center Code R-33 White Oak Laboratory Silver Spring, Maryland 20910	1	Mr. James R. Moden Naval Underwater Systems Center Code 3632 Newport, Rhode Island 02840	1

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 359

	<u>No. Copies</u>		<u>No. Copies</u>
Dr. R. Nowak Naval Research Laboratory Code 6130 Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Dr. John Kincaid Department of the Navy Strategic Systems Project Office Room 901 Washington, DC 20376	1
Dr. John F. Houlihan Shenango Valley Campus Pennsylvania State University Sharon, Pennsylvania 16146	1	M. L. Robertson Manager, Electrochemical Power Sonics Division Naval Weapons Support Center Crane, Indiana 47522	1
Dr. M. G. Sceats Department of Chemistry University of Rochester Rochester, New York 14627	1	Dr. Elton Cairns Energy & Environment Division Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory University of California Berkeley, California 94720	1
Dr. D. F. Shriver Department of Chemistry Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. Bernard Spielvogel U.S. Army Research Office P.O. Box 12211 Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	1
Dr. D. H. Whitmore Department of Materials Science Northwestern University Evanston, Illinois 60201	1	Dr. Denton Elliott Air Force Office of Scientific Research Bldg. 104 Bolling AFB Washington, DC 20332	1
Dr. Alan Bewick Department of Chemistry The University Southampton, SO9 5NH England	1		
Dr. A. Himy NAVSEA-5433 NC #4 2541 Jefferson Davis Highway Arlington, Virginia 20362	1		

TECHNICAL REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST, 051A

	<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>		<u>No.</u> <u>Copies</u>
Dr. M. A. El-Sayed Department of Chemistry University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90024	1	Dr. M. Rauhut Chemical Research Division American Cyanamid Company Bound Brook, New Jersey 08805	1
Dr. E. R. Bernstein Department of Chemistry Colorado State University Fort Collins, Colorado 80521	1	Dr. J. I. Zink Department of Chemistry University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California 90024	1
Dr. C. A. Heller Naval Weapons Center Code 6059 China Lake, California 93555	1	Dr. D. Haarer IBM San Jose Research Center 5600 Cottle Road San Jose, California 95143	1
Dr. J. R. MacDonald Chemistry Division Naval Research Laboratory Code 6110 Washington, D.C. 20375	1	Dr. John Cooper Code 6130 Naval Research Laboratory Washington, D.C. 20375	1
Dr. G. B. Schuster Chemistry Department University of Illinois Urbana, Illinois 61801	1	Dr. William M. Jackson Department of Chemistry Howard University Washington, DC 20059	1
Dr. A. Adamson Department of Chemistry University of Southern California Los Angeles, California 90007	1	Dr. George E. Walraffen Department of Chemistry Howard University Washington, DC 20059	1
Dr. M. S. Wrighton Department of Chemistry Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139	1		